THEOLOGY

VOL. LXII APRIL, 1959 No. 466

Editorial

DR REINHOLD NIEBUHR is now an elder theologian, and unhappily the state of his health has for a good many years prevented him from paying those visits to Britain that used to excite and delight us. It is not easy for the young to realize how much he meant to us twenty years ago. He showed us that it was possible for a theologian to speak about what was happening in the contemporary world without merely moralizing or emitting pious platitudes. For he had a power that was novel then, and is none too common now, of analysing movements and events and political crises and of discovering more in them than was imagined by the professors of secular creeds and ideologies. Current affairs, as he commented on them, were seen not only to be more complex than appeared at first sight, but also to have an uncanny light cast upon them by the categories of Christian faith. He had, as was well said, an "extraordinary perception of the complexity of human motives and of the relation between morality and interest and power in society". He was both radical and realistic. He was always puncturing illusions, especially utopian and perfectionist illusions, but he never encouraged fatalism or disengagement.

We have been writing as though his work was all in the past. But that is far from being the case. He continues to bring his cleansing and clarifying judgment to bear on what is happening in the world, and his latest book, *The Godly and the Ungodly: essays on the religious and secular dimensions of modern life*,[1] is as exhilarating and as incisive as those we have for long been treasuring. Some of the essays here are addressed directly to the American scene, and are none the less interesting to a British reader for that, but most have to do with questions that directly concern us all. The title of the volume arises from the first essay, which deals with the paradox that the U.S.A. is "at once the most religious and the most secular of Western nations". How is the apparently flourishing condition of religion in America to be appraised? Niebuhr's answer to the question, as was to be expected, is by no means simple: it contains a warning to us all that a return to religion is not necessarily or in itself a sign of grace.

Another essay shows how developments in Russian and American history have belied the doctrinaire logic of the national creeds, and have been affected by contingent circumstances. The longest and most important essay is on "The Relations of Christians and Jews in Western Civilization". Seldom has a Christian been able to mark with such penetration how much Jews and Christians have in common and where their faiths inevitably diverge.

[1] Faber and Faber, 21s.

This is a book that should be in your public library. It is theology for the general, though not for the casual, reader.

* * * * *

The Roman Catholic Church has had to face hostility and hazards of all sorts since the onset of the French Revolution. Its relations with civil governments have varied extraordinarily. Mr E. E. Y. Hales, who in *The Catholic Church and the Modern World*[1] surveys those relations in the different countries of Europe and America (North and South) from the French Revolution to the present time, inclines to the view that the Church has suffered more from its declared friends than from its avowed enemies, and most from civil governments who wanted to control it in their own interests. He points out that Roman Catholicism has made more progress in Protestant countries than in those where it enjoyed a privileged relationship to the State. Though he piously excuses the popes who sought to maintain traditional ecclesiastical establishments, he manifestly believes that nowadays it is to the Church's advantage to be separated from the State and to embrace the liberties which Gregory XVI condemned when they were advocated by Lamennais. It does not seem to occur to an ultramontane Catholic any more than to a Scots Presbyterian that it is also to a Church's advantage when civil government is in a position to check the excesses of ecclesiastical authoritarianism.

This book is not a general history of the Roman Catholic Church in the modern period; it does not profess to deal with theology. It is a well-contrived, popular introduction to the Church's political relations. It is readable and contains a great deal of useful information, much of which will serve as illustrative matter for anyone who is contemplating writing an essay on the problem of "Church and State". It is an *apologia pro papa* by one who laudably desires to correct the notion that the popes, or many of them, have been blind reactionaries. He succeeds in showing that there was often more to be said for Vatican reactions than could be seen at the time by progressives. But Mr Hales would be more persuasive if he were less of an apologist. Observe how gingerly he treads when he permits himself to suggest that a papal pronouncement was misconceived. E.g. on Pius IX and the *Syllabus errorum*: "Though the issues involved are still a matter for argument, upon which Catholic historians are not entirely agreed, it would seem that, tactically speaking, the issue of the Syllabus was a move whose wisdom may well be doubted" (p. 132). We should like to think that the following sentence was intended to be ironical, but we fear it was not: "Leo XIII demonstrated in his encyclical Providentissimus (1893) how wide were the bounds within which scholarship could, and indeed should, operate" (pp. 190 f.). The weakest section in the book is that on "Modernism", of which Mr Hales seems to have very little inside knowledge.

In his "Bibliographical Guide" he does not mention C. S. Phillips'

[1] Eyre and Spottiswoode, 30s.

two volumes on *The Church in France* nor D. A. Binchy's *Church and State in Fascist Italy*, books which are much more on the target than many he does mention. When referring to French priests he says "the Abbé X" but not "the Père X": why? Lamennais died in 1854, not 1852 (p. 99).

* * * * *

We have received the following letter from the Provost of Southwell:

"Two or three of us think that there is a need for an inexpensive word book, interpreting in untechnical language some of the words most frequently used by Christian scholars to-day. It would not be a work for scholars; it would be a work seeking to interpret the language of scholarship so as to make it available to those of us who are in parishes, and to laymen who want to do some thinking about contemporary theological issues.

"We would like to test the opinion of other people about this, and we invite anyone who is interested to write to us and say that he is interested, and to send with his letter a sample list of the words which he thinks should have priority of treatment."

Those who are interested should write to the Very Rev. H. C. L. Heywood, The Residence, Southwell, Notts.

* * * * *

It is not our regular practice to publish sermons in THEOLOGY, but we are happy to be able to publish in this number the sermon preached by the Sub-Warden of the Bishop's Hostel, Lincoln, at the consecration of the Bishop of Bristol. In the May number we shall be publishing the sermon that is to be preached by the Rev. F. A. Simpson, Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, at the consecration of the Bishop of Southwark.

* * * * *

A new and revised edition of C. R. Forder's *The Parish Priest at Work*[1] brings this now well-established book up to date. Any parish priest who does not possess a copy may yet wonder how he managed for so long without one. Mr Forder is a natural archdeacon, if that isn't a contradiction in terms.

* * * * *

Autres temps autres mœurs. "'Vox vera; or, a Sketch for the Future, by Simplex' (Lumley), is dedicated collectively to the Queen, Prince Albert, the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Queen Dowager, the Duke of Cambridge, the Duchess of Kent, the Duke of Wellington, the Thrower of the Gauntlet, and the Prince of Wales; each of which personages is considered typical of some great moral or religious principle. We cannot understand a word of the pamphlet . . ." —*The Christian Remembrancer*, July–December 1847, p. 222.

[1] S.P.C.K., 21s.

Christology and Creation

THE sedate eighteenth-century genius of Joseph Addison has an assured place in any Anglican hymnal. "When all thy mercies, O my God", "The Lord my pasture shall prepare", "The spacious firmament on high"—these meticulous, carefully phrased hymns are well attuned to English piety, and in their versification evince a character at once disciplined and astringent. They reflect a cosmos of harmony and law.

> The unwearied sun from day to day
> Does his Creator's power display,
> And publishes to every land
> The works of an almighty hand.

But both scientific discovery and biblical theology have forced us to relinquish this comfortable idea of an orderly and rhythmic creation. Instead we find ourselves in the midst of a creative process, rather than inheriting a ready-made universe. It is the less surprising, therefore, that the Priestly Creation myth in Genesis should turn out to be, not the effortless theophany too easily imagined, but a hymn, as formal and as organized as Addison's own, to a Creator God who achieves his creation through victory over the gloomy wastefulness of primeval chaos. Behind the deceptively calm words "the Spirit of God was brooding upon the face of the waters" lie ancient Babylonian Legends of Tiamat, the monster of the deep, and her overthrow at the hands of Marduk the creator. The cold, turbulent waters of the flooded Euphrates had been for centuries the symbol and very power of formlessness, waste and void, to the people of Mesopotamia; and now the Hebrews, as they busied themselves in their close-knit exiled community, absorbed the tradition, and incorporated into their own psalmody the songs of a land no longer strange.

> Thou didst break up the sea by thy strength:
> Thou brakest the heads of the sea monsters in the waters.
> Thou brakest the heads of leviathan in pieces,
> Thou gavest him to be meat to the people inhabiting the wilderness.
> Thou didst cleave fountain and flood:
> Thou driedst up mighty rivers. (Ps. 74. 13–15.)

The "people of the wilderness" represent a different tradition, the demonic forces of the desert: jackals padding softly round the camp, terrifying the bedouin children, or screech-owls descending, claws and beaks outstretched to rend the prey. Small wonder if in the cold inhospitality of desert nights they and others of their kind became embodiments of night monsters, evil powers which disturbed the guard as he slumbered nervously at his watch. Later on the Hebrew conception of the Demonic was to widen its scope, being seen in the envy and rapine which divided city against city, kingdom against kingdom; in the avenging fury of barbarian armies; in plague, pestilence and famine; in the remembrance of slavery in Egypt. Nor does the demonic lack its symbols in our own day. Thus the portentous

cloud, the size of a man's hand, has swelled to a new horror, as the homely early morning mushroom, like manna brown and friendly in the innocent dew, becomes the symbolic shape of total and pestilential destruction.

In *The Interpretation of History*, Paul Tillich defines the demonic as that which destroys form; and this would seem to be the biblical conception. The process of creation is itself a struggle. Every force which assails the lives of men from within and from without is subdued by Jahweh the Creator, the great I AM, the self-subsistent affirmation that life is good. This is one element in the Old Testament tradition. The spear of light is thrust into the darkness—light which is lucidity in confusion, order in chaos, which the darkness does not overcome. The firmament divides, the moon and stars are ordained, and the sun brings life to the virgin land.

> The day is thine, the night also is thine:
> Thou hast prepared the light and the sun.
> Thou hast set all the borders of the earth:
> Thou hast made summer and winter. (Ps. 73. 16–17.)

The round of the seasons is set in order, the seal of victory, with its ever-recurring sequence of life through death, the seed sown in the good ground, springing up and bearing fruit a hundredfold.

The scriptural account of creation is not static, but dynamic: it is, as is the whole of Scripture, the revelation of a God who acts. This is what creation is—the pulsing, ever-straining tension between Jahweh and the deep, between order and chaos, light and darkness, love and hate—and it is between these two poles that our temporal existence is slung. It is the consciousness of these two opposites, and their seemingly eternal struggle, which motivates all the dualistic philosophies and religious systems.

But there is a further and more far-reaching strand in the Old Testament tradition: the declaration that Jahweh is Lord and responsible for all. "Shall evil befall a city, and the Lord hath not done it," (Amos 3. 6b): "I form the light, and create darkness; I make peace, and create evil; I am the Lord, that doeth all these things" (Isa. 45. 7). Behind the legends of Marduk and Tiamat is the more incredible tale of a God who is the creator of both. It is the supreme mystery of all, and after some twenty-three hundred years of meditation we are still no nearer understanding it.

> If I say, surely the darkness shall overwhelm me,
> And the light about me shall be night;
> Even the darkness hideth not from thee,
> But the night shineth as the day:
> The darkness and the light are both alike to thee.
> (Ps. 139. 11–12.)

It might be intolerable, but it is not. Men have their own ways of protecting themselves from God, as they have ways of protecting themselves from each other, and the history of religion might be interpreted as the divine underwriting of that endeavour. The

ordered functioning of society is a complicated network of self-protection, each man committed to, and guarded from, his neighbour. So, too, the ordered functioning of religion may be seen as an imposition of harmony, certain conventional boundaries agreed upon, ordering but not confining men's response to their Creator; and in the priestly chant of the first chapter of Genesis the mighty wrestling of Jahweh, which results in the emergence of life and light from chaos and darkness, is hymned in formal, balanced strophes at the New Year festival as a perennial declaration of what the world truly was.

The creation of Israel, the priestly nation, is the creation of a harmony in mankind reflecting the harmony which emerges from the creative process—or, more accurately, it is the seed of that harmony. The name Israel, "he who strives with God", is symptomatic not only of the course of Jewish history, in which a nation is forged, almost against its will, to be the instrument of the Divine purpose, but also of the whole creative process itself. Of the Old Testament we may indeed say, "This is what life is like".

And this variegated, tormented, serene, arid, intoxicated, bigoted and unforsakeable collection of writings portrays through the religious imagination, and conveys through the intellect, the raw material of the new creation which is fashioned out of it. Jesus the Jew, fulfiller of the law, steeped in the teaching of the Rabbis, nourished on the songs and sagas of a romantic national past, filled with the dreams and imagery of an apocalyptic future—this greatest of the Israelites, Son of David and climax of the human race, deserved the name of Israel in its alternative meaning, "God strives", for in him the creation myth is enacted again.

The Old Testament is not a tale of victory, but of defeat in victory. Within the myth of creation must be set the myth of the Fall, which occasions, in the narrative of the flood, both a resurgence of the old chaos and an act of re-creation. But here, too, the note of victory is sounded, its sign the rainbow (sunlight in rain, joy in sorrow) and its condition the covenant with Noah, which disowns the irresponsibility of Cain and lays the basis of all human order. "At the hand of every man . . . will I require the life of man" (Gen. 9. 5c).

In Christ the note of defeat in victory is changed to one of victory in defeat, the inevitable way of the world exchanged for the new way of the Christian. God in Christ, clothed in all the pain and limitation, as well as in all the solace and felicity, that flesh is heir to, conquers and slays the dragon of chaos in man. Satan falls like lightning from the heavens, and the demons acknowledge Jesus as Lord; he subdues the storm and walks on the watery deep. All the mighty acts proclaim the kingly rule of God.

But it is in the Cross—that rejection by Israel of its true self; the ceremonial slaying of God's Elect by God's elect; the death of one man that a people might not perish, wedding the formal responsibility of Caiaphas with the vicarious responsibility of the Suffering Servant—it is in the Cross that the victory of the new Creation is achieved, for it is the supreme defeat in victory, the rejection by the

creation of him by whom it is created: and it is changed into that supreme victory in defeat which we call the Resurrection.

All this is anticipated in the Matthaean baptismal narrative which inaugurates the Gospel of the New Law. "Thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness" (Matt. 3. 15b)—with these words the Christ of Israel is immersed in the waters, the spirit broods above (like the dove from the ark bearing the green sprig of hope) and the new creation is proclaimed: "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased" (Matt. 3. 17b). The baptismal waters, the symbolic expression of death and chaos, are the victory over death and chaos, just as the Cross, the place of the outcast from the community, is the birthplace of the new community.

What we see in the new creation is analogous to the scriptural picture of the old. The gospel stories re-enact the ancient myth, though it is unlikely that anyone fully realized this in Jesus' lifetime. But perhaps this matters less than we might suppose, for the Gospel presentation of the life of Jesus is conditioned by the experience of the risen Christ in the lives of the Christian communities for which those Gospels were written. Their knowledge of the new life into which they died and were raised, their apprehension, however halting, of the harmony which underlies and results from the creative process, is mirrored here and expressed through their memories and traditions of the earthly life of Jesus. They knew him as here and now, not as there and then—hence their, to us, unscrupulous manipulation of what our barren intelligences will alone recognize as "historic fact". The apostolic tradition, so dearly prized, retailed the significant facts. To be an eyewitness of the Resurrection was to be able to attest with peculiar particularity to the experience of all, and the gospel traditions are of the same character. They attest and illustrate the facts of the risen life of the new creation as the Christians themselves experienced it. They were known to be true since they conformed to that.

Hence, too, the variety in the portraits of the Christ. Each community had its needs, its aspirations, its particular vocation. In the Gospels those needs and aspirations are "Christologized", and thus become matter for vocation. The Gospels challenge us because they are the medium of the living Word, the Word of the first creation summoning men to fellowship in the new. In this the Word defeats the powers of chaos and darkness, effecting creation through tension and antithesis.

So it is with the emergence of doctrine in the Gospel narratives. Mark, shaping his collection of miracle and teaching stories, broods over the collection of fragmentary lessons and memories with the tremendous secret of the Messiah foremost in his mind. The need of his audience to be reassured in the face of Nero's persecution, their sense of obscurity and rejection and of their overwhelming privilege, are all Christologized in his Gospel: that is to say, they are related to, and expressed through, the earthly life of the Lord. Their knowledge of that life is mediated to the Christians through their present situation, in the midst of which the Christ presides, endures, and

conquers. So, too, the Matthaean pre-occupation with the Law, with the ancient Scriptural traditions, and with the fact of salvation, is Christologized in the majestic figure of Jesus, giver of the New Law; while in Luke, the spread of the Gospel to the Gentile world, the compassion and humanitarian outlook of a good physician, are Christologized in his portrait of Jesus, the descendant of Adam, the bringer of reconciliation, and restorer of the lost. The process is most apparent in the fourth Gospel, where the theme of conflict between light and darkness is fully developed, and the victory of the light won in the hour of darkness, rejection and defeat.

The pattern of the Messianic Life, of the New Law, of the Ministry of Reconciliation, of the Word made Flesh, is the pattern of the new creation. This is seen to be the same pattern as that of the old creation, both from its context, which is the historical life of Jesus, fulfiller of the Judaic Law, and from its imagery, the fulfilment of the Scriptures.

These Christologizing Gospels are not only our sole source of knowledge of the historic Christ: they are also the revelation that the words and deeds of Jesus of Nazareth only acquire their true meaning when seen in their Christological context—that is, when the Spirit quickens to the act of re-creation and we acknowledge him as Lord. So, too, with the Christian—his words and deeds only acquire their true meaning when they are Christologized, seen in relation to, and as decisive for or against, the living Word. In themselves they are formless, waste and void; only in reference to him do they really signify anything.

The tension of the Christian life, and its seemingly unresolved conflict, are reflected, then, in the biblical imagery of the two creations. What was historically enacted in the death of Jesus, and symbolized in the image of the crucified Messiah—namely, the overthrow by God of his own workmanship, and its simultaneous resurrection into fulfilment and glory—is known by us, as it was known to Jesus, in pain, dismay and contradiction. But we have this knowledge (the common knowledge of the creation) with a difference. Fallen man, the old Adam, for ever struggling against the tide of his destiny, for ever knows defeat in his hour of seeming victory: redeemed man, a member of the second Adam, for ever knows victory in the hour of his self-inflicted defeat, since his experience is the experience of re-creation.

The new creation is born of the old, and the drama of our redemption is played out simultaneously with the drama of our creation. Our lives are lived not, as Joseph Addison imagined, against a static harmonious background, but rather as part and parcel of a never-ceasing process symbolized for us in the terms Creation—Fall—Redemption. In the biblical myth these states of being are described as successive historic events. But the author of the fourth Gospel Christologizes them into a single whole in his portrait of Jesus as the incarnate Logos by whom the world was made, whose rejection is the definition of the word "sin", and whose victory on the cross is the handing over of the Spirit, the power of the new creation.

We, no less than the Gospel writers, know him as here and now, rather than as there and then. We find our experience Christologized in him, and of life itself we find it to be true that "this is my body: do this for my anamnesis". Our lives have become gospels, and his context, as he teaches, heals, is betrayed, dies and rises in us. The Spirit who broods over the baptismal waters, creating us anew, is the same Spirit who gives us life. Daily we fall, daily we are raised, as the dove flies back to our storm-tossed ark bearing the spray of hope. As for our pain, it is the pain of having to know the new creation in terms of the old—as struggle against chaos and the demonic powers of destruction and incoherence. We do not know the glory of the Parousia here and now, though we do know it as implicit and potential, just as the full glory of the Messiah is hidden in the despised and rejected figure of Jesus. But this pain is also a knot of union between Christ and his creation—his pain and the world's pain—that single mystery to which we can only momentarily perceive the clue. It is the mystery of creation in which Christians have to share, "redeeming the time because the days are evil" (Eph. 5. 16).

But when all is said and done there does remain a rest for the children of God. If the Scriptures are wrought of struggle, discord and revolution, titanic symphonies of tragedy and contradiction, they are also shot through with the dream of harmony and fulfilment, the serene, measured, ever-diverse perfection of the fugue of the Trinity when all experience is Christologized into glory on the manifest Day of the Lord. Of that Day our present knowledge as Christians is a foretaste and a pledge. As Addison wrote,

> The storm is laid, the winds retire
> Obedient to thy will;
> The sea that roars at thy command,
> At thy command is still.

In the coincidence of those two commandments is to be found the measure of our peace.

GLEN CAVALIERO.

Anglican-Presbyterian Relations in Scotland

THE ECUMENICAL UNDERSTANDING OF THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

IT has been observed that to ask the Church of Scotland to believe that it is important for the Church to have bishops is to ask for a major change in Presbyterian thinking, and that the magnitude of this change and the difficulty of bringing it about are often seriously underestimated.

This important point raises the question of the nature of the Scottish public's outlook on matters ecclesiastical (apart altogether from the perverse and inflammatory influence of a certain section of the daily press), and the task of Scottish Christians in acquiring and propagating an understanding of Scottish ecclesiastical history at

once more charitable (ecumenically) and more accurate (historically). If "the primary and irreducible assumption of biblical theology is that history is the revelation of God",[1] then the Church must be prepared to take the history of the Christian People as seriously as the Old Israel took the history of the Chosen People before the Incarnation.

The breach of communion between Episcopalians and Presbyterians in Scotland took place in 1689, and in evaluating the authority of the Revolution Settlement for the life and polity of the Church of Scotland to-day and in the future, it is necessary to examine fully the historical background: to inquire into the effective factors of the Revolution Settlement, and to ask whether the underlying theological principles have the same cogency to-day. The historical background proves on examination to be extremely complex, and seems to call for the ratification of a large number of serious misunderstandings among the assumptions which inform public opinion. It is inevitable that the bias of public opinion should be against a minority in its own midst, and the Scottish Episcopal Church, which is less than a twelfth of the size of the Church of Scotland, suffers grievous misrepresentation, malicious and ingenuous. Part of the joint task of educating public opinion will be to make people aware of the strength of the Episcopalian party in the pre-1689 Church and of the ecumenical importance of the continuing witness of an indigenous Episcopal Church. (Part, too, will be to make Episcopalians aware of the challenge which the vigour and variety of the life of the Church of Scotland constitutes to their idea of themselves as the faithful remnant and the Presbyterians as apostates whose strength is—paradoxically!—theologically irrelevant.) Ignorance and prejudice are in part attributable to the serious inadequacy of the treatment of ecclesiastical history in the school text-books on Scottish history, which appear to be incapable of treating their sources (the earlier Scottish historians) with the critical appreciation these require.

Amidst the competitive perjury of the earlier partisan historians, precise statistics seem to be beyond recovery. But it appears to be the case that in 1688 the Presbyterian party in the Scottish Church was somewhat smaller than the Episcopalian party. The Covenanting party had been in eclipse since the Restoration, having discredited itself to such an extent in the eyes of most Scotsmen under the Commonwealth and Protectorate that the Scottish Restoration Parliament, which abolished the existing ecclesiastical constitution in the Act Rescissory, was content to leave the pattern of the Church's polity to the discretion of the king. Thus it was the king who, with the authority of Parliament, and with the tacit or explicit approval of the northern Synods and the reluctant acquiescence of the southern, restored the Scottish Episcopate in 1661–2.[2] One of the reasons Charles II gave for the re-introduction of bishops was the desirability of harmonizing in polity with the Church in England and Ireland.

[1] G. Ernest Wright, *God Who Acts* (S.C.M. Press, 1952), p. 50.

[2] F. Goldie, *A Short History of the Episcopal Church in Scotland* (S.P.C.K.), pp. 10 ff.

In 1689 the Scottish bishops remained loyal to their oath of allegiance to the Stuart monarch-in-exile, and refused to recognize King William's title to the throne. The state of the parties in the Scottish Church had not changed, and antipathy to Roman Catholicism was characteristic of both. The bishops' attachment to the Jacobite cause, however, led to the effective coalescence of the anti-episcopal interest of the Presbyterian party, the anti-Stuart interest of the Government, and the anti-Papal interest of the Scottish public, and so the Estates abolished episcopacy (1689) and established Presbyterian order and the Westminster Confession of Faith (1690).

This left the Episcopalian party hopelessly divided. Episcopalians who were not Jacobites were torn between their loyalty to the Crown and their loyalty to their bishops. Until Scottish Episcopalianism became identified with "loyalty to the Stuarts in spite of their Roman Catholicism", the trumpet gave an uncertain sound; and as soon as the identification was complete, we may see the cause of disunity as primarily political, and the persecutions of Episcopalians as simply the loyal efforts of the Scottish people (though loyalty was not always the individual's motive!) to destroy a fifth column. This is why the intensity of persecution in the eighteenth century varies directly with the gravity of the threat of a French-supported Stuart military success. It was after the Jacobite cause had passed from the realm of practical politics into the realm of romance that the Scottish Episcopal Church sought and obtained reconciliation and relief. By that time its numerical strength was very low.

To-day in the Scottish Episcopal Church there are some who, knowing this historical background, not only share the general Scottish affection (however unhistorical) for Bonnie Prince Charlie but also boast of the loyalty of the Episcopal Church to the Stuarts. Much could be said on this subject, but in any case it is surely harmless for a man to speculate as to which side he would have taken if he had lived in 1689 instead of 1959. The matter becomes serious only when such speculation is raised to the level of religious conviction and supported by doctrinal principles—when it becomes a theological myth that shapes men's practical attitude.[1]

Such a myth in the Scottish Episcopal Church to-day is that of "King Charles the Martyr", to whose cult the late Miss M. E. M. Donaldson was much devoted, and whose commemoration is included in the Kalendar of the Church on 30 January as "The Beheading of King Charles I".[2] The historical truth behind the myth is that Charles's character can be salvaged intact from the wreckage of his reign; but to call him a Martyr of the Church is to say that he died for the constancy of his witness to the Church's faith in Christ, and to say that is, among other things, to make an identification of politics and faith that is theologically untenable to-day. Similarly, on the Presbyterian side, "it is at least doubtful whether Jenny Geddes, whose action in throwing a stool at the Dean of Edinburgh

[1] There is no suggestion here that all theological myths are false.

[2] Fortunately the proper collect has long since disappeared from the Prayer Book.

as a protest against the reading of the [1637] Liturgy is commemorated by a tablet in the High Kirk of Edinburgh, had any historical existence: but be that as it may, the story is a 'myth' (in the technical sense of that word) which has a powerful influence in Scotland even now".[1]

It is frequently alleged that the Scottish people has always been hostile towards bishops. Leaving aside the first thousand years, we may observe that the grounds of opposition to episcopacy have changed several times since the Reformation. In the mid-sixteenth century, the corruption of the Church and the opposition of the Scottish bishops to the reforming party account for the hostility towards the bishops and their displacement by a Reformed polity which included powerful superintendents.[2] In the reign of James I and Charles I, Episcopacy was widely opposed in Scotland (with varying success) because the introduction of bishops was perceived to be a means of the Crown to gaining control of the Church. Again, as has been shown, the much more radical hostility to Episcopacy after 1689 derives from the political allegiance of the bishops who happened to hold office at that time. None of these principles is operative in Scotland to-day. Both the traditions concerned are reformed traditions. The State control of the Church is a principle abhorrent alike to Scottish Episcopalians and Scottish Presbyterians, and the continuing independence of a re-integrated Scottish Church is an axiom of the present discussions.[3] Finally, there is to-day no general correspondence whatever between the ecclesiastical and the political affiliations of Scotsmen.

Thus, while it would be true to say that since the Reformation bishops have not been universally acceptable in Scotland and that for over two centuries there has been a strong bias against them in Scottish public opinion, it is also true to say that the different principles upon which from time to time this hostility has been based are no longer operative, and that consequently the emotional entrenchment of the principle "Nae bishops in the Kirk", has to be regarded as a *non-theological* factor of disunity—i.e. as a prejudice all informed Christians must seek to overcome.

To-day the Episcopal and Presbyterian traditions in Scottish Christianity confront each other in a way they have never done before, for (1) neither to-day is uncritical of its own history, (2) each is concerned to take seriously the other tradition's theological understanding of itself, and (3) both are concerned to re-integrate the two traditions, and not simply to reduce the number to one. None of these factors was present in Anglican-Presbyterian relations in the seventeenth century, and not until the present day have all three been operative

[1] "Anglo-Presbyterian Conversations: Some Reflections", by Fr Andrew Blair, C.R., in *C.R. Review*, No. 220 (Christmas 1957), pp. 11 f.

[2] See "The Office of Superintendent in the Reformed Church", by Gordon Donaldson, in *Common Errors in Scottish History* (Historical Association, 1956), pp. 13 f.

[3] Joint Report, section 3 ("The Modification of Church Polities"), second paragraph.

together. The ecumenical situation that Anglican and Presbyterian Scotsmen are facing to-day is therefore a new one, in which the vocabulary of the past is not wholly adequate.

The practical problem is to take seriously what God has been doing in blessing the life of the other tradition, while at the same time not underestimating what he has given our own tradition. This problem is complicated by the fact that for many generations we have fostered mutual misunderstanding. We are therefore called not only to be penitent and forgiving towards each other, but to acknowledge the likelihood that in reaction against each other we have each to some extent distorted our own tradition, with at least two serious results: disproportion among the constituent elements of our contemporary apologetics, and a tendency to falsify the past retrospectively. Such reaction produces an uncritical over-emphasis on whatever happens to distinguish the one tradition from the other—an attitude which precludes the theological revaluation of historical developments that is called for by our confrontation with each other as living traditions.[1]

It is sometimes said that the recent conversations were premature. If by this is meant that the delegates *were not aware* that it would be a long time before the Church of Scotland could come to adopt episcopacy, this can be shown to be untrue. The impression that the Church of Scotland is being hustled into episcopacy is a fiction of the press, not of the Joint Report, which was said by its authors to be "no more than an exploratory survey", in the course of which "problems have been raised which we have deliberately set aside or not discussed to a conclusion, recognizing that the time for dealing with them will not be before the Churches decide to go beyond the stage of 'conversing' about unity and begin to plan it".[2] Clearly many years of study and discussion are implied. If, on the other hand, it is held that it is too early to join in examining together our own understanding of ourselves and each other, it must be said that the evidence points to the present time as the most favourable since the ecclesiastical division of the two traditions.

The two Churches have both been involved in the revolution in the understanding of the Bible implied by the movements of critical scholarship and biblical theology, so that to-day as never before we can stand humbly side by side under the judgment of the Gospel. God has given us to hear the word of God afresh, and the word we are hearing is drawing us together, in ourselves and in our understanding of the whole content of the Christian faith, including the nature of the Church. So also the two Churches, through their participation in the World Council of Churches (and their interest in the ecumenical movement generally), have come to share a new attitude towards traditions other than their own that may be called ecumenical thinking, and now that they have become acutely aware of each other this new dimension bids fair to transfigure Anglican-Presbyterian relations. It would seem, therefore, that irrespective of the

[1] See John White's quotation from Dean Stanley in his Moderatorial Address, *Proceedings of the Union Assembly, 1929*, pp. 17 f.

[2] *Joint Report*, section 1, ad fin.

total or partial inadequacy of the proposals of the Joint Report as a basis for discussion,[1] the time for discussion *has come.* And to withdraw into our previous isolation from each other would be both a plain denial in practice of the ecumenical principles we profess, and a wilful deafness to the vocation Christ has given us in our day.

It seems possible to formulate the following principles of Anglican-Presbyterian discussion.

(1) It was seen in the recent conversations "that the questions arising between Episcopalians and Presbyterians lay at the heart of the differences evidenced by other divisions within the Body of Christ, and that a notable act of reconciliation between them could not fail to introduce a new and promising element into the whole field of ecumenical relationships".[2]

(2) In a Committee Report to the Lambeth Conference of 1958, it is suggested "as regards the situation in Great Britain, . . . that relations between the Church of Scotland and the Episcopal Church in Scotland should be settled by negotiations between these two Churches before relations between the Church of England and the Presbyterian Churches are carried further".[3]

(3) Each of the two Churches acknowledges Christ's will for the unity of his Church, and each is concerned to implement this acknowledgment in Scotland. This involves examining *together* the nature of the unity Christ wills for his Church.[4]

(4) Each of the two Churches confronting each other acknowledges that the continuing existence of the other is of theological significance. Each recognizes that God has manifestly blessed the ecclesiastical life of the other, and each understands that the structure of the other is related to the nature of the Church in the will of Christ in a way that makes the examination of the other's structure relevant to its own understanding of the will of Christ.

(5) Since the sphere of God's redemptive activity in Christ is history, the task of understanding the will of Christ for his Church necessarily involves the theological evaluation of the history of the Church.

(6) Since God is love, it is impossible to confess the truth of God in uncharity. In revaluating the past (to confess the acts of God in history) we must speak the truth in love, for the very practical reason that without love it cannot be the truth that we speak.

(7) Episcopalians and Presbyterians in Scotland "belong together" historically as well as theologically. The central theme of Scottish ecclesiastical history since the Reformation is Anglican-Presbyterian relations. We cannot discount each other without misunderstanding our own history. Therefore it is only in commitment to each other

[1] See, e.g., Wm Stewart, *A North Indian Comment on Relations between Anglican and Presbyterian Churches*; E. L. Mascall in *Church Quarterly Review*, January 1958; Bishop Lesslie Newbigin in THEOLOGY, June 1958.

[2] *Joint Report*, Introduction, last paragraph.

[3] *The Lambeth Conference*, 1958 (S.P.C.K.), part 2, p. 44.

[4] This joint enterprise has already begun in the Conversations of 1932–4, 1949–51, and 1955–6. But some of the conclusions reached (e.g. the organic nature of the unity we seek) are now being challenged in places.

that we shall rightly understand Christ's will for his Church in Scotland in the twentieth century.

(8) The will to unity *creates* a measure of unity. That is to say, Christ uses the movement of our human will towards unity both to manifest more clearly our "given unity" and to lead us into deeper unity. While, therefore, there is no room to-day for an ecumenical optimism that takes our present disunity lightly, neither, on the other hand, is there room for an ecumenical despair that takes seriously human sinfulness without taking seriously the grace of God and the power of his Holy Spirit. The call to prayer for Christian unity is not a last resort, but a first principle. *Ut omnes unum sint* is not a cry of despair, but a prayer of hope.

R. T. Halliday.

The Office of a Bishop[1]

For as in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive.—1 Cor. 15, 22.

In these words Paul announces one of the great themes of the New Testament. It is a theme which, as in a certain kind of symphony, is not at all obtrusive, but is none the less persistent and controlling. It is the theme of Christ as the Representative Man. Christ stands for all men, that he may draw them to himself. He stands for all men in all their varied needs and concerns; he stands for all men as men, and not just as religious men; nothing is outside the scope of his representation. He is what Luther calls the Proper Man. Yet he is not only Man inclusively, but also *a* man, a particular man; therefore his ministry on earth was in all respects personal, not, so to say, official—personal and, for that very reason, particular—this man called, that woman healed; these men warned, this man commended. And that which he left behind after his departure was not a doctrine, nor an ethic, nor yet an institution, but a company of persons. "Our representative will call", says the advertisement; and when he calls he turns out to be not just an official, but a living person with a way of his own; and what we call the "personal touch" makes all the difference. It works wonders, as no official hand-out ever could. The ministry of Christ, then, was *both* representative *and* personal. So the Church which is called to continue this ministry must also be both representative and personal; representative in that it addresses itself to all human concerns and activities; personal in that it is carried on by personal dealing as between man and man. So it was that, under the Spirit's guiding, as we believe, the chief source of authority and leadership in the Church came to be vested in one who is himself a representative person—not in a committee, nor in a written constitution, but in a representative person. The bishop is one who expresses in his office both the representative and the personal character of the Church's ministry, which in its turn continues

[1] Sermon preached in Westminster Abbey at the consecration of the Bishop of Bristol and the Bishop of Tonbridge, on 6 January, 1959.

the ministry of THE Representative Person, Christ, the Proper Man. This is the reason why the bishop is to be honoured; not because he is endowed, as if by magic, with superior gifts of intellect or holiness which might enable him to lord it over men; but rather because the meaning of the gospel and the structure of the Church are embodied in his office—an office, be it remembered, which can never be dissociated from his person, as a man among men. However great may be the need for the bishops to meet for joint consultation and decision, this cannot be allowed to obscure the fact that the Christian ministry, which is personal as well as representative, is focused, not in a group or committee, but in a succession of individual persons. As Dean Church once put it: "What is before us is a succession of persons, singly in themselves the recognized depositaries of public authority in things spiritual—not merged in a body of equal teachers, but standing out singly, chief after chief, to take the consequences, each man of his own administration, for praise or blame."

The bishop, then, is to represent in his own person the Church to the Church, and the Church to the world; therefore he stands for the Church in its fourfold nature, as One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic. In the first place, his office is sacramental of the mission of the Church *Catholic*—the general Church, the Church which belongs to the ordinary man, which conveys the main stream of Christian life and tradition, which bears witness to the all-embracing Lordship of Christ over every area of human life and toil and care, which refuses to be identified with any particular opinion, with any particular outlook or ideology which might limit the universality of its caring, and reduce it to the level of a sect. The office of a bishop should reveal Christianity as a thing interwoven with history, the history of men and nations; its roots, as has been said, deep in the past, its hope set in a continuing future. One of the most vital functions of the episcopate as it has developed in the Church of England is to preserve that Church from all parochialism, both of time and place. And perhaps one of the corollaries of this is that we should think it altogether right that the bishop should cherish concerns which spread beyond the immediate administration of his See—that he should take with him into his episcopate those special interests and enthusiasms which have been kindled in him by his previous ministry and experience. So, for instance, we rejoice that in the new Bishop of Bristol the Church of England will have within its episcopate one who can speak with great weight of authority on the world-wide mission of the Church, and all that concerns the reunion of the divided communions of Christendom.

Then—Unity. In Christ shall all be made alive; alive in Christ who is himself the Representative Man, the source and centre of the Church's unity. So the bishop is understood traditionally as protecting this unity. Here, too, he is a representative person, standing for the Church Universal in his dealings with the local manifestations of it in the diocese in which he presides; so, when he comes to a parish for the Laying on of Hands in Confirmation, he comes as representing the whole Christian family. We have come to see more

and more clearly in recent times that what we call Christian community is the life blood of the Gospel, and the prerequisite of all true evangelism. If this be true, then the office of the bishop is the more significant. Yet he who represents *this* kind of unity and fellowship must do so, not as an official, but as a living person. So may the bishop most surely manifest this unity in and through his personal dealings with his own flock, and in particular with his own clergy, into whose needs and problems he will enter with a sympathy both generous and informed. He will be a bishop *to* his clergy in the way of guidance and leadership, and also a bishop *with* his clergy in the way of partnership and co-operation. Thus his relation with them is the same, though on another level, as their relation with the people of the congregations. There is formed in this manner a kind of hierarchy of relationship, in which there may come to full flower that indefinable quality which we call so inadequately "Christian community".

Now the unity of the Church which the bishop represents derives from the sending of Christ into the world, not from any particular philosophy or world view of her own. In being One, the Church must also be Apostolic, guarding the witness of the Apostles to the one Saving Event of Jesus Christ. It is sometimes argued that this function is performed by the books of the New Testament, which preserve for ever the apostolic witness—and this is true. Yet this witness is to one who is himself a Representative Person, Christ, the Proper Man. So the Church of England sees the witness preserved not only in the pages of a book, but also in a succession of living persons. The Apostolicity of the Church is represented in the bishop and in his office.

At this point we encounter a traditional function of the bishop to be the defender of true doctrine, the champion of all sound learning which seeks to interpret to every age the Apostolic witness, the Truth as it is in Jesus. The association of the episcopate with theology, as indeed with all branches of learning, is very precious. It is good that the bishop should be in the closest personal relation with the theologians and teachers of the Church at large. The need is all the greater at this present time when the insights of modern scholarship cry aloud to be integrated more closely with the Church's pastoral and evangelistic ministry. It is really only comparatively recently that modern scientific method has been applied to every single branch of human study and concern; swift and bewildering have been the changes in our whole way of thinking and world outlook; consequently traditional Christian doctrines need re-interpreting now just as urgently as when the Church early on broke loose from her moorings in Judaism and encountered Greek civilization and philosophy. Perhaps we have only scratched the surface of this problem, at any rate in the practical sphere. The theological theorist, when left to himself, easily becomes ineffective or irresponsible; the practitioner, if isolated, tends to waste much time defending embattled positions in theology which no longer are defensible. Theoretical and practical theology must marry; and the bishop stands in the position of one

who can do much in the role of matchmaker. Perhaps he can best sustain this role if he does not interpret his duty to uphold true doctrine in too negative a fashion; if, as Bishop Westcott put it in a similar connexion many years ago, he does not meet new and disturbing truth with the words "no further", but rather with the words "speak, Lord, for thy servant heareth" . . . if he extends to the theologians a warmly personal and encouraging sympathy, so that they may feel that they have in him a leader who welcomes and seeks to understand their work, not merely in so far as it may happen to be useful in the defence of this or that beleagured fortress of doctrine or tradition, but because he shares with them a love of the truth, and believes with them that all truth is of God.

"IN Christ shall all be made alive." One, Catholic, Apostolic . . . but what of that fourth way in which the Church continues the representative ministry of her Lord? What of holiness? Must not the bishop represent this also, and perhaps this above all? Here one must speak little if presumption is to be avoided. This alone, it may be, is all that needs to be said: all Christians are called to holiness, the bishop no more, no less, than the others. Yet there is perhaps a particular holiness which belongs to his office as bishop. And it consists in the will to be concerned first and foremost with the spiritual and the personal rather than the administrative and routine—in the will to consider first the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy and faith; so that the bishop comes to value most of all his titles and designations that of "Father in God". Every parish priest knows all too well the temptation to crowd the day with little duties rather than devote himself to the things which may yield less observable results but which are the only justification of his existence as a priest. How much harder is the case of the bishop with his so much heavier load of administrative duties, with his so much more varied responsibilities. How much greater his need of that faith, wisdom and courage which, in doing with singleness of mind the things that must be done, has to leave many other things undone. The call to holiness then, in this as in everything else, is a call to the inner life of prayer, to the guarded time of quiet and communion with God, to devoted sharing in the corporate worship of the Church.

It is one of the greatest tragedies of Christian history that the word "bishop" has carried in the past, and still does carry in some quarters today, overtones of all that is un-holy and un-apostolic—imperiousness, worldliness, prelacy. It is a great tragedy because, properly understood, the word "bishop" is one of the loveliest in the Christian vocabulary . . . rich in the suggestions of the warm-hearted care of a father for his children; the devoted protection of a shepherd for his flock; the strong inspiration of the leader for his people. This is so because the office of bishop is not one of elevated status, but of personal representative service; because his office brings to focus the mission of the whole Church to continue the ministry of him who is THE Representative Person, the New Adam, the Proper Man. May it be the high privilege and destiny of the Church of

England to-day humbly to preserve and commend this ideal of the bishop's office.

So now we unite in prayer for these men who are to be consecrated as bishops in the Church. May they find their sufficiency not in themselves but in the faithfulness of God, who upholds all the world in the embrace of his mercy, and whose gracious will it is that in Christ shall all men be made alive.

T. G. A. Baker.

Learning "to do" the Eucharist

Every parish priest, whether his parish be in the West End of London, in the country, or in the heart of one of our great industrial cities, must be concerned about bridging the gulf between the Church and the masses outside. Again, on those occasions when a family or an individual, who are not worshippers, come to church because of a bereavement, or to hear banns called, one wonders what, if anything, they have made of the service. There is also the old problem of doing something to keep the adolescent from lapsing, and the difficulties of avoiding a Sunday School type of religion which is completely separate from the main services of the Church. Along with this, we are faced with the added difficulty of finding well-instructed laity to help staff a Sunday School. Again and again one hears demands made for a service that will help those on the fringe to come right in and understand the service of their parish church.

I was brought up at a church where the main acts of worship on Sunday were the Parish Eucharist and Evensong. We were loyal to the Prayer Book and that book was used and no other. It is my belief that the Prayer Book can only become understood to those who have been instructed in its use, and that the service that should be taught is the Lord's Service, and furthermore those without can best understand the actions of that service, and that therefore it should be explained to them.

The main services in this artisan parish of 7,000 are the Parish Eucharist and Evensong, and with all these ideas in my mind I decided to start a Conducted Eucharist for children and their parents and others on the fringe. I would stress my having done this not merely as an experiment, but above all because I believed I must help others to know and love the Lord Jesus through the doing of his own service. Hence also the need to do it regularly week by week and when opportunity allows on weekdays as well, e.g. Ascension Day. I would stress the need of regularity, this is most important for children, otherwise an occasional doing of the service would only confuse them.

Two factors seemed to militate against the introduction of such a service. Would the result be the collapse of the Sunday School, and more important for a Parish Eucharist set-up—would this create a division among the members of a family so that the adults and children would be worshipping at different services? These objec-

tions were faced and it was decided to go ahead, since, for one thing, the Sunday School numbers were such that the risk could safely be taken, and with regard to the Family Eucharist suffering as a result, well, that would depend on the way matters were explained to the parish.

The year was 1954. I had been instituted in April. It was decided to start the Conducted Eucharist in September, so that most people would have had their holiday by then and also this would allow four months of preparation. Week by week the children were told about it, and taught small parts of the setting to be used (Merbecke). They were familiarized with the prayers and also told that it was meant for everyone who could not come to the main Family Service at 9 a.m. The Sunday School would continue as before. Sermons were preached on the need for *doing* the Eucharist, and the adults were told that this service was *not* for the faithful, but for those on the fringe, who could later be moved into the Family Eucharist. Any old or infirm people would be welcome to come. While all this was going on a layman was found who agreed to conduct the service. He was given simple and pithy directions in writing for his use, e.g. "Stand". "The priest will read the Epistle. Sit." "Let us now own up to God and say we are sorry for our sins." Copies of *The Children's Worship* by Phyllis Graham were purchased, also albums and picture stamps for the children.

Finally, the day came and the hour of 10.30 a.m. and the Conducted Eucharist was born in our parish. Much prayer and thought had gone in preparing and our efforts have been abundantly blessed.

The children take it in turn to collect the alms and to bring up the Elements. We are careful over our choice of hymns, and the gradual is always the fifth verse of 508 (E.H.). The boys take it in turn to serve, and of late we have two servers each week owing to an increase in their numbers. The service itself is substantially the same as at 9 a.m. though, because of the time factor and a single-handed priest, we omit the Invitation, the Comfortable Words and the Prayer of Humble Access. The Creed is said, and the Sanctus and Gloria sung, as also the Agnus Dei. We average eight communions of people who could not be at church earlier on. The address is as short as that given at 9 a.m. but is delivered much more informally, often the children being taught by the method of question and answer. We start the service with a hymn and there is the Gradual Verse and Offertory hymn, as also a hymn during the communion and after the blessing. The children stand for most of the prayers and only kneel during the confession, absolution and for part of the consecration prayer and for the blessing. We have a small nave altar for the service and the children themselves help to prepare for the service and to clear up afterwards.

How has the parish co-operated? Very well indeed.

This parish has accepted the service as being absolutely necessary for helping adults and children to understand and join in the main act of Christian worship, and for getting them ready for the Family Eucharist. None of those who formerly came at 9 a.m. transferred

themselves to the 10.30 a.m., and, in fact, it is quite easy to get people to move to the earlier family service after confirmation. The regular worshippers invite, and for the first time accompany, any newcomers who are unfamiliar with the Liturgy, to the Conducted Eucharist. I have had it pointed out by the faithful that it is now no longer possible for their friends to say, "I didn't go to church because I can't understand the service, nor do I know what to do". They have a very simple answer to such statements: "Come with me at 10.30." Servers give freely of their time to train the young who wish to enrol as such.

What effect has this service on our parochial life? The Sunday School has grown tremendously and we get an average of 80 children at 10.30 a.m. on ordinary Sundays (plus adults). There were about 40 children in the Sunday School four years ago. To-day that number also has been doubled. Many children come both at 10.30 a.m. and 3 p.m., and it must be borne in mind that many of the older ones (and adults), who originally came at 10.30 a.m., now come to the Parish Eucharist and Evensong. We have had very few lapses either among the adolescent newly confirmed or among the children, for the idea of doing the Lord's service on his day has not only been implanted firmly in their minds, but they seem to understand much better what they are doing. The whole parish, children and adults, have become much more missionary minded. The total number of communions in 1953–4 was 2,584; in the year 1956–7, 7,600. The number of confirmation candidates for the years 1940–53 numbered 86. For the years 1954–7 the number was 89, and each single time during the latter years we have had more confirmed in a single year than in any single year before 1954. These numbers may not seem very impressive, but we have to remember the kind of parish we are dealing with—the size and the fact that many of the younger people are moving away from their parents' homes to homes of their own.

In conclusion, I would mention that I know of six other parishes in the diocese where the situation and set-up are completely different, but where the Conducted Eucharist flourishes and where, as a consequence, new life seems to have come to them. They are all Parish Communion parishes which can truthfully be called "Prayer Book Catholic".

H. P. Burgess.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. G. T. Cavaliero is Tutor of the Bishop's Hostel, Lincoln.

The Rev. R. T. Halliday is Curate of St Andrew's Church, St Andrews.

The Rev. T. G. A. Baker is Sub-Warden of the Bishop's Hostel, Lincoln.

The Rev. H. P. Burgess is Vicar of the Church of SS. Mary and John, Saltley, Birmingham.

CORRESPONDENCE

TRAINING FOR THE MINISTRY

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

It is interesting that those who write most on the vexed question of training for the ministry are not themselves in the kind of work for which that training is designed. Quite clearly, it is assumed in the Church of England that the parochial ministry is the one for which the ordinand is trained. We are right, therefore, to demand that the academic and vocational training should meet its needs. Whether our present system meets the needs of the ordained don, schoolmaster, organizing secretary or monk is beside the point. The question is, does it help the average parish priest who is trying to give the intellectual and spiritual lead to the people in his care? As one of them, I should like to make the following points in relation to what both Dr J. A. T. Robinson and the Principal of Cuddesdon have written.

1. Parochial clergy often work in very uncongenial places; dirt, squalor, monotony, the absence of intellectual stimulus, the ambitions of suburbia and the rest are destructive of the intellectual and spiritual qualities which should be the marks of the minister of the gospel.

2. The weight of modern secularism is intensely strong in any world into which the Christian penetrates. For example, modern science, education and industry all contain pressures which are basically hostile to the Christian view of the world. Are we equipped to stand against them?

3. The modern welfare society has taken away from the parson many of the tasks which previously secured his place in the community and through which he was able to exercise his ministry. The place of the modern parson is far less secure than it was a generation ago.

In view of these factors I suggest we need to look carefully at the kind of training we give to men who are going out to do the hardest of all jobs. Enthusiastic amateurism is not enough. It is easy to hide behind a façade of pastoralia a complete inability to engage the real enemy in the contemporary battle of ideas and values. So often we see "theology", as our "theologians" see it, as a very arid study of little value except for the experts who write for the *J.T.S.* We do not despise the academic niceties of those who write on "Lebanon in the Targums" or "Ossius of Cordova"—in fact, they are to be encouraged—but this is not the kind of theology which is relevant to the working ministry. It is worth reminding Dr Robinson how little confidence the average parish priest has in the work of the professional theologians and how irrelevant he finds so much of their work. How often, for instance, do we get a book of the quality of H. H. Farmer's *The World and God* or of Quick's *Doctrines of the Creed*?

At the same time there is reason to question Mr Knapp-Fisher's attitude to the spiritual life. The parish priest finds that his theological understanding and his prayers, related as they must be to his own life and that of his people in the world, are not two separate or opposed concerns. Theological understanding, sensitivity to secular society, a loving care for people and a real confidence in God's power in the world are all part of the life of prayer. Our prayers are real, fervent and persistent when we have become aware of the enormity of the gospel's assertions and are convinced of its relevance to the deepest needs of man and society. Not until then have we begun to pray.

Whatever the Principal of Cuddesdon may say, there is an unhealthy and untheological preoccupation with the "spiritual life" in many quarters today. It is a world with its own jargon, appealing to some temperaments but frequently as irrelevant to the Christian's essential life as what we pass for "theology". The tendency (shared by the Principal) is to take the monastic ideal as the only measuring rod of spiritual maturity and to hold this before the ordinand. Experience proves that parish priests who have picked up these habits in the days of their "making ready" are not necessarily any more convincing as "messengers, watchmen and stewards" in "this naughty world" and that others who have learned to pray and think theologically, not by being detached, but by being more deeply immersed in the world and its concerns, are frequently more vital apostles of the "Lord of Glory".

The unhealthy thing about our present theological colleges is their artificiality, unrelated as they are to the best theological learning on the one hand and to the real world on the other. What is fondly called "the common life" is often so precious. Why do so many principals refer to the "boys" and why do so many ordinands ape the mannerisms of the staff? We shall no doubt have to retain something like the present system for some time to come—and it's not all bad—but could we not have fewer and therefore bigger and better colleges? Bringing together little pious huddles of men in semi-monastic groups in the depths of the country is not the best way to train men for the kind of ministry which I, for one, have always had to exercise.

Yours faithfully,
L. G. Tyler.

Leigh Vicarage,
Lancs.

CHRISTIANITY AND CULTURE IN AFRICA

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

Dr Hinchcliff's "Letter from South Africa", with its survey of the problem of "the preaching of the gospel by people from one culture to people in another", is of interest in itself, and doubtless

has an application in Asia and the Middle East, but I doubt if it is relevant in Africa. The essential difference between these areas is that in the East there are extensive cultures of a high order, backed by hundreds of years of recorded history, which have shown themselves capable of withstanding the impact of the West. In Africa there is, except in areas of Islamic influence, no such thing. There are instead scores of little primitive cultures, which have no high religion to sustain them and are rapidly crumbling before Western influence.

Dr Hinchcliff, living in Johannesburg, can subscribe to the idea of the two Africans, the "westernized" African of the towns and the "primitive" African of the reserves. I who live in the reserve, albeit not in South Africa but in Kenya, can assure him that this concept, while still containing some truth, is rapidly becoming as out of date as that of the "two nations" in England. To-day, except among a few "backward" tribes like the Masai, the African hardly exists who is not ready to exchange his own culture lock, stock and barrel for ours. The demand for education—which means of course Western education—is fast becoming universal. Indeed, the attitude towards it in this part of Africa has now become almost one of idolatry. Respect for education is displacing respect for age (which itself was respect for the education of the day), and influence in the reserve is passing at breakneck speed into the hands of the educated young man. The fact that he generally restricts himself to one wife has already had a considerable effect on the practice of polygamy, that most intractable of missionary problems.

We may lament this wholesale disintegration of African cultures, but we cannot prevent it. And if we start troubling ourselves at this date with the questions of inter-culture communication the Church will only be laughed at for living in the past. We shall be going out into the bush to find a naked savage, when all the time the man we seek is sitting in the next room dressed in flannels and blazer. It would not be the first time that the Church has been left a generation or two behind.

But that there *is* a problem is undeniable. The sects are flourishing while the churches of the missions frequently languish. Why is this? While in the past sects sprang up because of the problem of polygamy and for other reasons which could be described as cultural, to-day such factors are of decreasing importance. But a new, vital and increasingly powerful factor is taking their place—the nationalism which is starting to sweep Africa. It is this which makes an African-run church so attractive, and which arouses antipathy towards the missions. Nationalism is an emotion which has few strangers. In England it was responsible for the hatred with which the Roman Catholic Church was for so long regarded. It now looks like gaining control over most of Africa. Is it an emotion with which the missionary churches can come to terms? This is the vital question, for it looks as though the future of the churches in Africa will depend on their success in handling it.

Yours sincerely,

M. L. Sanderson.

P.O. Box I,
Kakamega, Kenya.

THE MAGI

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

Mr Bishop seems determined to misunderstand me! I was at pains to say that the translations of *μάγος* in the versions took their origin from an attempt to baptize the pilgrims of Matthew 2. If Mr Bishop can unearth an Arabic translation (contemporary, of course) of Justin Martyr, I might be persuaded to abandon the thesis that the Magi were quacks, but in the meantime I cannot conceive of any Hellenist Christian in the first century understanding anything other than "dabbler in the black arts" by *μάγος*. Or is Mr Bishop asserting that there was a Greek-Arabic Lexicon on every lectern in the Levant?

NASHDOM ABBEY,
BURNHAM, BUCKS.

Yours faithfully,
C. S. MANN.

UNCHRISTIAN LITURGY

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

As the Communion Service in the Prayer Book has come under attack, it seems to be a good opportunity to mention one small feature of it which, while not "unchristian" itself, is likely to give a false impression of Christianity, and which could easily be altered. This is the practice of reading the first of the Sentences for the Offertory more frequently than any of the others: "Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven." The reading of this verse Sunday after Sunday to the accompaniment of the clinking of silver must inevitably strengthen the tendency to identify all "good works" and indeed all charity with the giving of money. Surely this text is not about money at all: indeed, if it were it would be a contradiction of Christ's command to give alms unobtrusively. It is rather a reminder that the only way to spread the gospel effectively is for Christians to be a living advertisement for Christianity; and that if churchgoers are disagreeable and selfish people, however conspicuous their "good works" in the narrow sense, the Church will be judged accordingly.

It may be held that this text is particularly suitable, since the Offertory means far more than the mere taking of a collection; but one cannot assume that all communicants are well instructed in the deeper meanings of the service, and it is the impression which is actually made which matters here, not the significance which could be explained. Almost any of the other Sentences provided would be more helpful than the one which in fact is most used, for as they are explicitly about giving money they cannot lead to this misunderstanding.

10 NORTHMOOR ROAD,
OXFORD.

Yours faithfully,
L. H. OPPENHEIMER.

PART-TIME PRIESTS

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

The article by the Rev. John Bickersteth in the January issue of THEOLOGY follows on from the suggestions made by Dr Barry in his book *Vocation and Ministry*, and I think Mr Bickersteth has added two very important points to that book. The first is that a supplementary ministry *does* work in practice, and the second is that it ought only to be used in very small parishes. He says, however, that there are very few small parishes in the Church of England in which the idea could be adopted. Surely this is not so. In Norfolk and Suffolk, to quote only two dioceses, there are several parishes which have a population of under a thousand. In these an incumbent could quite easily work on a farm or in a nearby factory as well as doing his pastoral work. I believe that in the Norwich diocese at this moment there are forty vacant parishes. If some of the smaller of these had a part-time priest surely it would be better than none at all?

A five-day factory week or regulated times of work on a farm would allow this priest to minister to his parish (of perhaps about five hundred souls) in the evenings and at week-ends. We all know that it is a desirable thing to have a full-time priesthood, but in modern circumstances this supplementary ministry seems the only answer to our problems.

Who would lose by this idea? The small parish certainly would not, as they would have a priest of their own at last, whereas before they were probably part of a "three-parish" living. The Church would not lose either, as we would gain another pastor and, incidentally, would not have to bother about his stipend! Neither would the new priest lose, because probably he would be fulfilling something which God had told him to do, but which circumstances had prevented him from doing. Mr Bickersteth has also shown how invaluable the idea is from the point of view of understanding one's fellow-men. Why do we dither over this? Why has Convocation not made a bold decision to experiment with the idea as suggested by Lambeth?

Yours sincerely,
MALCOLM A. JOHNSON.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE,
DURHAM.

BOOK REVIEWS

CHURCH DOGMATICS. By Karl Barth. Vol. II, "The Doctrine of God", Part 2; Vol. IV, "The Doctrine of Reconciliation", Part 2. English translations edited by G. W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance. T. and T. Clark. 55s. each.

Two further massive half-volumes of the *Chuch Dogmatics* are here made available in an English version. Any reviewer must first

pay tribute alike to the majestic scope of the author's work and to the unflagging energy and skill of his translators. Vol. II, Part 2, is concerned with the two themes of election and of ethics. The first of these is dealt with in a manner both original and stimulating. Barth insists on the absolute sovereignty of God's predestinating will, but at the same time emphasizes throughout that this must be seen as something that occurs in and through Jesus Christ and not in any sense behind or apart from him. This is followed by a treatment of ethics under the heading of the command of God. Ethics, Barth says, must come in here because it "belongs not only to dogmatics in general but to the doctrine of God" (p. 512). But could not the same claim be made with equal justification for any other branch of dogmatic theology? Vol. IV, Part 2, deals with the exaltation of the Son of Man and the resultant sanctification of man. Here, as in the treatment of Election, the main emphasis is that renewal of life has come to every man in Jesus and that unbelief is self-contradiction, a denial of the truth about ourselves.

All these themes are worked out with great power and with a wealth of exegetical support. They are expounded on such a scale that it is impossible to do justice to the treatment of them in a comparatively brief review. It must suffice to say that no one could fail to find a wealth of stimulation and inspiration in the profundity and the vigour of the theological exposition.

Nevertheless, within the context of this primary recognition of the theological greatness of the work, four peripheral criticisms which have grown out of the reading of these 1,600 pages may be set down.

(1) The work is too long. This has frequently been said. I believe that it can rightly be said in the only proper sense that the words can bear—namely, that what is here said could without loss have been said more briefly.

(2) The exegetical passages, which are frequently the most illuminating of all, sometimes read more into the text than can reasonably be allowed. E.g. the insistence on a connexion between the παραδοῦναι of Judas betrayal and that of Christian tradition involves a badly misplaced ingenuity (Vol. II, Part 2, p. 482).

(3) There is a tendency towards loose affirmations of a speculative character which ill conform to the professed basis of Barth's thought. E.g. What justification is there for speaking of conditions under which "God does not will to be God"? (Vol. II, Part 2, p. 308).

(4) There is an element of obscurity which is clearly deliberate. E.g. it is no accident or oversight that after an exhaustive treatment of the theme or Election covering 506 pages, we are still left in doubt whether Barth believes that the New Testament teaching implies universalism or not. He appears to do so, but never formally commits himself.

But these are peripheral. If these volumes be taken not as final models but as stimuli for our theological work, they will be of incalculable benefit to the life and thought of the Church.

Maurice Wiles.

Ibadan.

THE MASS AND THE ENGLISH REFORMERS. By C. W. Dugmore. Macmillan. 30s.

It is an undoubted advance towards a scholarly reassessment of the Reformation to devote a serious study to the conflicting eucharistic doctrines that so troubled the sixteenth-century English Church, and for this reason Dr C. W. Dugmore's painstaking reconsideration of the many issues involved is most welcome.

The author has selected a large canvas on which to highlight the Reformed strife against a background discussion of the patristic and medieval ideas of the mass. Following hard on the heels of Pierre Batiffol, he traces the gradual development of a double stream of medieval eucharistic thought stemming from the "realist-symbolism" of Augustine, and the more markedly realist tradition of Ambrose. Two chapters devoted to eucharistic theology in the Western Church, and another concerned with the later medieval development, serve as vehicles to Dr Dugmore's avowed aim: to depict the English Reformation as not merely a reaction against Ambrosian realism (as it became distorted in the later medieval doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice), but as a conscious revival of the more spiritual Augustinian tradition. This section occupies about one-third of his work, and Dr Dugmore's well-packed chapters will prove of considerable value for their summaries of patristic and scholastic views, as also for the detailed footnotes which are another good feature of his book. Yet it is a pity that the relation of the classic medieval problem of universals to the eucharistic ideas of the Schoolmen has been shelved once again.

So far so good, but at this stage the author's determination to stress the legacy that the English Reformers inherited from the "auncient doctors" becomes a kind of obsession that, followed almost to the exclusion of any continental influence, spoils the end product as a whole. It is difficult to say how far this plea for an independent approach is valid, for the so-called "Supper-strife" of the period provides another instance of simultaneous discovery in the history of ideas. Yet how far are such investigations really made in "splendid isolation"?

To credit Thomas Cranmer with a scholarly independence of mind is certainly part of a sound approach. This is evident from an early letter to Joachim Vadian where Cranmer declares that he has ". . . come to the conclusion that the writings of every man must be read with discrimination". And, indeed, the Archbishop's stand in so proving all things and holding fast to the good was just as valid in doctrine and liturgy, as in his dramatic reavowal of the Reformed faith before the stake. Nevertheless, despite the efforts of the Henrician hierarchy to place an effective ban on the writings of both continental and Lollard Reformers, there was nothing approaching modern Iron Curtain techniques to ensure success. And apart from the fact that ideas know no barriers, for Cranmer the damage was already done when, as a roving ambassador in the early 1530s, he had seen something of Reformation faith and practice. Although

the phenomenon of simultaneous discovery is important therefore—and historians know of Cranmer's researches from the massive commonplace books of "notions in garrison, whence the owner may draw out an army into the field on competent warning (Fuller)"—to attempt to make out a case for the English Reformers' getting their eucharistic ideas independently from the Fathers, and not to some extent via the continental Reformers, is surely to court disaster. In almost every respect the English Reformation is Act II of a continental drama played out on a different stage. One of the dangers implicit in any reassessment is that of swinging the pendulum too far the other way, and whilst Dr Dugmore has attempted to recapture the medieval background to this controversy, he has undervalued the dominant intellectual climates of the day in the driving power of first the Lutheran, and then the varying shades of Swiss, Reform.

In Part II of his book, therefore, Dr Dugmore's discussion is somewhat lopsided, and there is a definite depreciation of continental influence that appears to regard ignorance as bliss. The old description of Luther's eucharistic doctrine as "Consubstantiation" is to the fore yet again, although that expression is not to be found in the *Werke*. Likewise, a good description of the controversy between Luther and Zwingli is hardly to be found in A. Barclay's *Protestant Doctrine of the Lord's Supper* (1927), although such a source would be a happy release for those English scholars who have struggled with the technical language of German historical theology in Walther Köhler's *magnum opus*: *Zwingli und Luther: Ihr Streit über das Abendmahl*. Nor can the impact of John Oecolampadius of Basel be dismissed quite as summarily (cf. p. 96) when he, of all the Reformers, is especially important for applying a vast patristic knowledge to the great eucharistic debate in the *De Genuina Verborum Christi*. Cranmer certainly knew the work, and doubtless drew upon it in his own appeal to the Fathers as he wrestled with "wilie Winchester" in the *Defence* and the *Answer*. When such a barrier is erected against the continentals, it is hardly surprising to find opposition to a Lutheranizing phase in Cranmer's early eucharistic development. Instead, Dr Dugmore prefers to back a strange alternative in the scholastic doctrine of impanation, and in this he is certainly original.

On a more trivial level it is curious to find that the author has such confidence in Abbé G. Constant, especially when Sir John Neale can be sharply rebuked. Again, Dr Dugmore must be unique in taking Ratramnus seriously, affording him full discussion in contrast to the scanty treatment accorded to Bucer and Martyr. And last, but by no means least from the point of view of sheer nuisance value, the author has coined a whole set of new terms in an attempt to clarify his case. In this particular controversy the ground is already thick with the wreckage of weird jargon, but "Suvermerianism", "dynamic receptionism" and "Virtualism" are nothing compared with Dr Dugmore's "non-papist Catholic", "Henrician Catholic", and the classic definition of Cranmer as standing ". . . in the Reformed Catholic, or Augustinian realist-symbolist tradition of eucharistic doctrine handed down from the days of the early Church" (p. 200)!

But, when all has been said, Dr Dugmore has tried hard to ring the changes, and his work goes at least some of the way towards a reconsideration of a most vital, if vexed, issue. Moreover, *The Mass and the English Reformers* has been handsomely produced by the House of Macmillan, and contains some fine illustrations. There are few printing errors, and perhaps the only important criticism that can be levelled here is that an "Index of Secondary Authorities" makes a very poor substitute for a proper bibliography.

Peter Brooks.

Cambridge.

The Image of the City and Other Essays. By Charles Williams. Selected by Anne Ridler with a critical introduction. Oxford University Press. 25s.

A review of this book must begin with a description. Mrs Ridler's introduction is of sixty-three full pages, of which more than a third are biographical, closely packed, and most valuable. Another twenty pages elucidate the distinctive themes to be found in all, or nearly all, the manifold writings of Williams, and the rest with his literary judgments, with the form of his novels, and with the strange history of the revolution in the style of his poetry that was still proceeding at the time of his death. The rest, except for a few notes, some of them very important, is by Williams himself.

The essays on literary subjects include his preface to Milton in "The World's Classics", another complementary paper on Milton from *The London Mercury*, a very amusing "brief biography" of Lord Macaulay, and other papers of notable range on subjects as diverse as Pope and Christopher Smart. After this we find a hundred pages on theological and moral themes, the incarnation, the image of the city, pardon and justice, exchange and the affirmative way. Some of these were articles in Theology, *The Dublin Review*, *Time and Tide*, and elsewhere. *The Way of Exchange* is a rare pamphlet, and "The Cross", a contribution to the symposium, *What the cross means to me* (1943).

Finally, a section "On the Arthurian Myth" forms an indispensable supplement to *Arthurian Torso*, where the unfinished *Figure of Arthur* was combined with a commentary by Prof. C. S. Lewis on the *Taliessin* poems. This section includes articles by Williams on "The Making of Taliessin" and on "Malory and the Grail Legend", and fragments from his notes collated and considered by Mrs Ridler for "those who are interested in the origins of the *Taliessin* poems". One of them would wish for more. In an appendix are five "collects composed for a marriage" in 1938, not wholly happy (we may question "fructiferous mediation"), but interesting exercises in a rare art.

The central pages provide the theological challenge. In Mrs Ridler's words: "At the centre of Williams's teaching lies this dogma, that the whole universe is to be known as good. But this was a truth to him as agonizing as it was inescapable." Creation was good be-

cause of coinherence, because we dwell in Christ and he is in us and the three Persons of the Trinity in one another. This was a vision developed in depth through the bearing of burdens, through that natural carrying of other people's parcels described so vividly in *Descent into Hell*, and interpreted, so far as interpretation is possible, in *The Way of Exchange* and *The Forgiveness of Sins*. The originality of this can easily be exaggerated. Mrs Ridler finds a like idea in Aquinas and in Cranmer. What is unusual is the isolation of this kind of trust and acceptance of trust from all the common intellectual certainties, the combination of faith with indifference to immortality and aversion to individual existence. "It is true that the gradual stupefaction of the faculties which normally overcomes a man as he grows old seems to make—if not the idea of immortality more attractive—at least the idea of annihilation less so. . . . But I cannot say I find the idea of immortality, even of a joyous immortality, much more attractive. I admit, of course, that this is a failure of intelligence; if joy is joy, an infinite joy cannot be undesirable." In the same essay on "The Cross", he went on to declare that "Our salvation is precisely our reconciliation, to nature and to the Church . . . to him and to our present state, both at once and both in one. We are, by that august sacrifice, compelled to concede to him the propriety of our creation."

George Every, S.S.M.

Kelham.

Jung and the Problem of Evil. By H. L. Philp. Rockliff. 30s.

Dr Philp, whose book on *Freud and Religious Belief* earned him a number of commendations in the press, here offers a refutation of the theological inferences which Dr C. G. Jung has drawn during the last thirty or forty years from his practice as a psychiatrist extending over a much longer period. Dr Philp's second undertaking was a considerably more difficult one. For Freud was from the first a professedly anti-religious thinker, and his critic could, with a free hand, set about re-evaluating his psychological discoveries from a theological point of view: whereas Jung is a profoundly religious mind, of clerical ancestry, who has spent a lifetime in elucidating the psycho-spiritual problems of other people in the light of his own, and vice versa. This experience he has been interpreting, more and more, with the aid of an encyclopedic erudition in religious history and symbology. The large body of religious philosophy he has thus built up presents heretical features which have been challenged by several good theological writers such as Frs Victor White, Josef Goldbrunner and Raymond Hostie; though they have as yet received little attention from Anglican theologians.

Dr Philp has produced a book of very considerable interest, composed partly in the form of an address to Jung and largely that of a direct colloquy with him. If the great Zürich doctor is somewhat of a modern Gnostic—a term that he does not resent unless it is applied

to him as a derogatory label—he has nothing of the ancient Gnostics' love of secrecy and esotericism. He frankly answers all Dr Philp's questions, and has freely enriched the book with a number of lengthy letters which seem not to have been published elsewhere: indeed, this has permitted him to make out a rather more persuasive case on this abstruse issue that his critic has framed against him.

It was natural to tackle Jung upon his treatment of the problem of evil, where his speculations are most conspicuously at odds with any Christian theological tradition entertained to-day; and regrettably so, in the eyes of some of the Christian thinkers he has most deeply interested. His demand for a re-formulation of the doctrine of the Trinity as a Quaternity, and the line taken in his *Answer to Job* appear to cut at the roots of any theism compatible with the function of the Church. Probably a clear statement of why this is so would have been more effective, for the cautionary purpose Dr Philp had in mind, than his defence of the doctrine of the negativity of evil (evil as a "privatio boni"), especially after he has disclaimed the intention of defending this and conceded that it is not a necessary article of faith.

Where Dr Philp writes most confidently and with the surest touch —as in his chapter on "Sin and the Sinner"—one nevertheless feels that what he is saying is not very closely relevant to the challenge presented by Jung's phenomenology of religion. Most of Dr Philp's critique is somewhat tentative, as though he were feeling somewhat out of his depth (which would be understandable if not very satisfactory!): occasionally he is inept, as when he says, on p. 185, that consciousness "cannot be completely explored". (Of course it cannot: in Jung's context, however, it is the instrument of exploration, if not the explorer; his point is that there can be no heightening of consciousness which is not also a deeper awareness of what had been unconscious.) And Dr Philp goes on to condemn techniques for attaining supposedly "higher" states of mind by means of drugs and other illicit devices, which have nothing to do with Jung's conception of the subject.

There is a longish refutation of the psychologist's essay on Job—that explosion of an "angry old man" which, for all its exasperating excesses, has flashes of lurid illumination that will not soon be forgotten—preceded by a pretty thorough summary of the whole work. Dr Philp's rebuttal of its argument is based upon points derived from modern biblical scholarship which are sometimes contradictory: this makes the method inconclusive even if it were the right one; and in fact it seems not to be; for Jung's study is an attempt to outline the evolution of the collective *imago Dei*, and as such it is full of mature knowledge and insight, whatever the errors and exaggerations to which it is impelled by the heat of the author's personal convictions. Surely, the need is to show just why the phenomenology of the deep unconscious, however brilliantly elucidated in relation to religious symbology in general, cannot, out of itself, produce valid theological principles, still less theological criticism. Jung in the past often showed himself aware of this: but in his *Job*

and other recent work he has kicked over the traces and acted as if it were not the case, projecting what are bound to be regarded as theological monstrosities. The pity of it is that this may further prejudice acceptance of his authentic psychological discovery that the individual, in any vital inner conflict, fumbles profoundly for an "archetypally" religious way out—which is a contribution of incalculable value and importance. Its philosophical and practical delimitation, however, seems still to be lacking. (Or has Mircea Eliade got nearer to the root of this matter than the previous critics?) At least, the lack of this as a starting-point has seriously handicapped Dr Philp's modest but valiant effort to demolish Jung's position on the problem of evil; making it so tentative as to be, in effect, more like another exposition of the theme by Jung himself.

PHILIP MAIRET.

LEWES.

SHORTER NOTICES

THE BIBLE (IN RUSSIAN). Published by the Moscow Patriarchate. 1956. Pp. 1272.

THE RUSSIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH: ORGANIZATION, SITUATION, ACTIVITY. Published by the Moscow Patriarchate. 1958. Pp. 230.

Two years ago the Russian Church republished the Holy Bible. It might have been regarded as an event except that we seem too expectant of events in that sphere. It is the well-known and well-tried Synodal version and derives from the work of the great Philaret, Metropolitan of Moscow, now more than a century ago: and the text is fully commented by Dr Casey in this journal (February 1957). But what would this republication tell us? That the Church now again feels herself? Her own account of herself is that she returned to herself forty years ago, when she was separated from the State; for that and the restoration of the Patriarchate are now seen as virtually one event. Of the resultant purgation, of which we read and thought so anxiously and sorrowfully, she is reserved, quite remarkably reserved. This bulky volume is equally reserved as to any event in current history except for the word it speaks about all events, ours included.

Indeed, what event concludes purgation, and how do we date it? We might all be disciples of John. What evidence do we seek? What would satisfy us? Not, one fears, that which we are given. We are taken back to the critical point when, separated from the State and (mark you) from education, the Church shared the fate of her people under her own regularly elected head. The rest is a narrative of her situation now, forty years on. "We have passed our examination," she says, "and we shall now tell you where we stand."

So this well-written report, with its numerous illustrations, sets before us an account of her present relations with the Soviet State, her own structure, the working of her 73 dioceses and their parishes, her theological colleges (8 secondary and 2 higher), her 69 monas-

teries and convents, her relations with other Churches, Orthodox and other, her part in the German war and in the propagation of peace. In all this she professes her acceptance of the new order. No longer a department of State, not a state within the state, disclaiming even the old Byzantine symphony of Church and State, she is content to be a private organization, the family of believers. Thus recollected and liberated from inhibitions internal or external on her priestly mission, she pursues the ministry of word and sacrament to her nation and people. The report quite understands that the things which can be said about the spiritual life of the Church must be said with reticence, and much cannot be said at all. But equally clearly the mission is defined as the salvation of souls. If we ask how all this can be in a totalitarian society, we simply restate the prime fact of the Church's sturdy survival; but she does not permit us to interpret it as her score over the State. And if we ask how a Church can get on when she has been shorn of the social apparatus of societies and is confined to the conduct of public worship and the religious life, the Russian Church replies that this is a good situation to inhabit.

When more than twenty years ago the then Metropolitan of Moscow, as *locum tenens* of the Patriarchate, condemned the writings of Fr Bulgakov, he seemed principally concerned by their presentation as Orthodox teaching. They were, indeed, part of the intellectual ferment of that and the earlier period. In a book published shortly afterwards, Fr Florovsky named this intellectual disturbance as in terms that which more than anything else in the Church called for purgation. He saw the remedy in prayerful recollection, an apocalyptic faithfulness, a return to the Fathers and a free meeting with the West. This last point is now on the agenda.

FROME. A. F. DOBBIE-BATEMAN.

MORAL VALUES IN THE ANCIENT WORLD. By John Ferguson. Methuen. 22s. 6d.

Prof. Ferguson starts by claiming that there has been no earlier complete study of this subject. This is true, and although the classicist will find much that is already familiar he will be stimulated to the re-appraisal of familiar beliefs. Also the fact that Christian *agape* is taken as the standard for evaluating moral concepts means that the approach differs from that of the pure humanist.

The book begins with values of the Homeric age and early Greek society and goes on to the cardinal virtues. Two interesting chapters treat of Friendship and Eros, and their self-interested character is brought out, though Epicurus's high ideal of friendship receives due credit. The virtues of Philanthropia and Homonoia, which became Concordia Augusta, are discussed and found paternalistic and condescending. Autarcy, self-sufficiency, is richly illustrated in its positive and negative forms and its essential selfishness shown, since "morality subsists in relationship to others". Roman *virtus* and *pietas* are

sympathetically treated, but the narrowness of the sphere within which *pietas* operates is emphasized, and there is a long chapter on "The Virtues of a Roman Emperor" with an excellent summary of the defects of these virtues. A chapter on "The Contribution of Judaism" might seem alien, since the Jews stood aloof from the main current of Graeco-Roman thought, but is justified by the author's desire to show the relationship of Christian *agape* to Jewish predecessors, notably Hosea. The final chapter shows the nature of *agape* and how it fulfilled all the conditions hitherto unrealized for a central moral value. The author confines himself to his own analysis of the New Testament evidence and the chapter is pregnant and stimulating, but when the whole book has been leading up to this, a more detailed treatment would have been welcome, for the Ancient World did not end with the New Testament.

The book is designed for the Greekless reader and Greek terms are transliterated into English and translated, but the famous line, Iliad 6, 208, is given in Greek only, inadequately paraphrased, and the epitaph on p. 161 in archaic Latin is left untranslated. At times the author's own depth of scholarship leads him to expect similar erudition in his reader. "Those whom they attack by name may have lain hidden under their Via Flaminia" will be obscure to anybody unfamiliar with Juvenal. The general reader may be misled by dogmatic statements on matters which are still controversial. Can it be said that "in fact" Horace's "Integer vitae" was about a little girl, Lalage? Again, the supposition that Orphic mysticism was mainly derived from Asiatic sources is more debatable than it appears here.

However, these are minor details. The author is to be congratulated on a work of wide scholarship, which, with its apt illustrations from classical and later literature, will be of absorbing interest to a wide circle of readers.

University of Nottingham. M. Whittaker.

Churches, Artists and People. The Thirteenth Report of the Central Council for the Care of Churches (1959). Church Information Board. 3s.

This report, full of sound sense like its predecessors, ought to be put into the hands of every parson in the country—free, gratis and for nothing. The cost of such a scheme would be about £3,000 a year. Dare I suggest that the Church Commissioners, whose income has latterly been increased by astute management, could perform an equally astute service by making a grant to this end? Too many of our churches (I speak as a diligent crawler) are ill-kempt and uncared for; too many of the clergy and laity, wishing to beautify, do not know where best to seek advice, or, worse still, do not realize that they need advice. A mere £3,000 would reduce the annual toll of vandalism and wickedness—believe me, it is not inconsiderable; and in terms of time, and temper, the saving to archdeacons and advisory committees would be enormous. If the distribution of the report is

too big a business for the Church as a whole, surely a single Diocesan will set an example to his fellows?

The 1959 report is a particularly good number. There are sections on new life for redundant churches, on how to heat, on how not to re-build the organ; Canon Boston forsakes the serpent, and other instruments at his command, to speak on the care of brasses; and out of ten book reviews no fewer than seven are by "household words" in the field of scholarship. There are sixteen illustrations, nearly half of modern glass—a balance, or lack of balance, to be explained by the Dean of York's contribution. He writes persuasively and with imagination, of course; yet he could have said more about one topic —the problem of where to seek a design. The average glass-painter produces glass-work that is skilful enough, but the design is often at the level of a chocolate box. William Morris was not ashamed to work for Burne-Jones, nor Galyon Hone for Dirick Vellert; cannot our glaziers to-day be content to paint glass—a difficult job in itself—and get their designs from other people? It is encouraging to learn from the Dean of Gloucester's introduction to this report that Mr John Piper, who has already entered the field of window design, is now engaged on a cope for Chichester: precisely what is needed—ideas from somebody who has made an independent reputation of his own.

I wish that this report could bear the imprint "Recommended by the Archbishop of Canterbury for Lenten Reading". A perusal of it could hardly fail to generate a sense of sin in many consciences; and the clergy and their churchwardens, glancing down the list of advisory committees, might be pleasantly surprised at the wealth of talent and experience to be found among those bodies.

King's College,
Cambridge.

Kenneth Harrison.

Adam of Dryburgh. By J. Bullock. S.P.C.K. for the Church Historical Society. 30s.

Medieval Scotland was a disorderly, rather illiterate, area which contributed little to the stock of Western culture. Adam of Dryburgh, a Scottish Premonstratensian who became a Carthusian, is one of the very few Scottish writers whose contribution to the twelfth-century renaissance of learning is worthy of study. However, any lengthy treatment of him is beset with pitfalls, since not much is known about his life and his works have the usual scholastic technicalities and are not very revealing historically. Dr Bullock might have been well advised to call his pleasantly written work "Adam of Dryburgh and his times", for it contains more about the latter than the former. Thus, chapters one and seven are largely concerned with general monastic matters and give little new information, whilst chapter eight has a discussion on the serving of parish churches by regular canons, which is relevant but marks no advance in the matter. Consideration of Adam's theological works is rather desultory and lacks

the solidity to satisfy the severer type of medieval scholar; there is no systematic consideration of the manuscripts and their textual relationship and only passing references to the dates of composition of his treatises.

But if the work will not entirely satisfy the specialist, it has much to commend it to the general reader. Dr Bullock writes with enthusiasm and shrewdness and gives a sound sketch of life on a twelfth-century cloister. His comparisons between monastic and Protestant piety are sympathetic and stimulating. The book is attractively and accurately produced.

PEMBROKE COLLEGE,
CAMBRIDGE. J. C. DICKINSON.

THE STUDY OF MISSIONS IN THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION. Volume Two. by O. G. Myklebust. Egede Instituttet, Oslo. N.p.

The first volume of this vast study was reviewed in THEOLOGY in January 1956. This second volume is concerned with the period 1910–50, beginning with the World Missionary Conference at Edinburgh, 1910. As a thesis it is the result of the most diligent and painstaking research; in this respect it is likely to be useful only to the specialist, and even a quite rare type of specialist. But the study has a much wider importance also. For it is fundamentally a plea that academic theology should take seriously the tremendous expansion of Christian missions. "That Christian missions have something of importance to contribute to Christian theology is the central contention of this work."

In addition to giving competent summaries of the background, Dr Myklebust provides full details of the extent of the teaching of missions, as a proper subject in the syllabus, in the universities and colleges of Britain, the United States and Western Europe. The question of a chair of missions in the leading universities of this country is seriously raised. The usual excuse, so far as we in Britain are concerned, is that we prefer to integrate the study of missions with that of Church history, the New Testament, comparative religion, etc. In theory this sounds very good—but in practice? One does not have to know very much about G.O.E. in its present form to feel some disquiet. The establishment of a chair of missions in Oxford or Cambridge, as in some of the continental universities, might do much to restore the balance. For, as the author shows, the study of missions is a new discipline which, like psychology, has assumed an independent existence in this century only. In this connexion it is interesting to be reminded that the Archbishops' Commission on Training for the Ministry, which issued its report in 1944, stated that if a proper place were given to the history of the expansion of Christianity in the curriculum of honours schools in universities "and a professorship of missionary history established, there would soon be better provision of books and a higher standard both of inquiry and teaching".

DOUGLAS WEBSTER.

THE TRIUMPH OF PRESBYTERIANISM. By W. M. Campbell. St Andrew Press. 25s.

The ecclesiastical history of Scotland, and more particularly that of seventeenth-century Scotland, can be written from either a Presbyterian or an Episcopalian point of view. Whether a non-partisan history exists I do not know. I am inclined to think that the nature of the subject would not permit one.

The provenance of this book is clearly Presbyterian. Dr Campbell makes no attempt to disclaim his partiality for one side in the controversies of the period; indeed, he gives the impression that all the honest Christians of seventeenth-century Scotland were Presbyterian by the simple device of omitting to mention any of the honest Episcopalians of the period. In his delineation of Presbyterian worthies, however, he is scrupulously fair, making no attempt to hide either the personal idiosyncrasies of ministers or the rather sordidly economic motivation of many of the laity. Perhaps he is helped to candour by the fact that Calvinism is not burdened with a doctrine of perfection.

To all but Presbyterians of the pure Scottish tradition the attitudes and arguments of the covenanters are likely to seem somewhat overstrained. Those who have grown up in the traditions of Laudian churchmanship will find it salutary, however, to dip into the memories of a people who for legitimate reasons detest Laud's memory. Most valuable to the general reader, perhaps, will be the concluding chapters, in which the inside story of the Westminster Assembly is told with skill and candour.

I get the impression that *The Triumph of Presbyterianism* is in intention a tract for the times, designed to reinforce the traditional Scottish opposition to episcopacy. As such I find it unconvincing, for while every Scottish Presbyterian must have some of the covenanting marrow in his bones he need not have the venom of ancient controversies in his veins. Upon one point, however, the framer of any union proposals involving Scotland would do well to take warning. The undoing of episcopacy in Scotland in the past was the fact that no provision was made whereby the bishops might contribute creatively to national life. The current proposals for "bishops in presbytery" must offer more than a "tulchanate" if they are to strike fire in Scotland.

UNION COLLEGE,
VANCOUVER.

JOHN W. GRANT.

THE INVADING GOSPEL. By Jack Clemo. Geoffrey Bles. 10s. 6d.

This poet's pilgrimage out of paganism of the D. H. Lawrence variety to membership of the Church is a compelling, vivaciously written, and sensitive spiritual autobiography. It is unusual in a number of respects: first, it has not been common recently to be so moved by Browning as Mr Clemo has been; secondly, he found his own way as a solitary individual to acceptance of the faith and only

later came into the Church; thirdly, his destination is what has been called Calvinist; fourth, it is unusual to find intellectuals so permanently stimulated by revivalist preachers.

This is the testimony of an Evangelical: "at its deepest level Church warfare is a unique battle between divine grace and human 'goodness', between God's merciful decision to come to man's rescue and man's innate conviction that he does not need to be rescued".

There are chapters on the literary influences upon him, on science, and on Christian married love. His conclusion, he says, has "obvious affinities with the Barthian doctrine of 'double predestination', and there are echoes of Spurgeon, Browning and Kierkegaard".

King Edward's School, Birmingham. Ronald Lunt.

Let's Think about Money. By Ellis Cowling. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

The whole point of this book is that it is concerned with how to live on the income you have, even though you are convinced that the income is too small. The book is not at all about price-mechanisms or any other technical concerns of economics. It takes the view that money is a trust to be used or misused, and that the use includes the need to give. Without unduly favouring any one method of giving, the author has most to say on the merits of a tithing system, each Christian giving one-tenth of his income to his church and his charities. This, the author claims, is at once simple, scriptural (with Christ's approval), and would greatly increase the financial resources of the Church. To a parson with one eye perforce ever on the slender resources of the parish treasury, and the clamant needs to be met, the book must seem irresistible. He will be wise to buy it. It will not convert his parish to tithing, but it will arm him at many points in his efforts to encourage his people to give in a considered way. The book is simple and down to earth, and should be of value in the struggle to kill the habit of throwing a few shillings to the church in a good-natured gesture, after much cajolery.

H. C. Wallace.

Chester Cathedral, from its Founding by Henry VIII to the Accession of Queen Victoria. By R. V. H. Burne. S.P.C.K. 21s.

Along with Peterborough, Oxford, Gloucester and Bristol, Chester was one of the new sees set up by Henry VIII after the dissolution of the monasteries. In each case a monastic church was chosen to be the cathedral of the new diocese. The history of such a foundation is not merely of antiquarian interest, for, at Chester, at any rate, it is closely related to the political, ecclesiastical and social history of the following centuries, as the Archdeacon of Chester so admirably shows, making use, for the first time, of the abundance of information available, mainly from the Cathedral Treasurer's Accounts. These ac-

counts, with one gap, form a valuable record of the life of the cathedral from 1541, the date of the founding of the see, until 1664, when the Chapter minute books begin.

The story is one of financial and other vicissitudes, of pluralism and non-residence, of care and lack of care for the venerable buildings which have retained so much of their original monastic character, of trouble with minor canons and lay-clerks, and, especially in the period of great wars, the ringing of the bells for victories by land and sea. We are given also what can be gleaned of the musical history of the cathedral. There is interesting information about successive deans as well as of members of the Chapter. It is noted that Bishop Lloyd, whose name is borne by a well-known house in Watergate Street, was the only King School boy to become Bishop of Chester. The saintly Thomas Wilson, who became Bishop of Sodor and Man, was a King's Scholar. The period after the Restoration saw a brilliant succession of scholarly bishops—Bryan Walton (1660–1), John Wilkins (1668–72), and, most famous of all, John Pearson (1673–86), of whom Bentley said that the very dust of his writings was gold.

The Archdeacon of Chester has used his sources carefully and well to present a history of the cathedral up to the year 1837. There are some attractive illustrations, which add to the interest of the book. There are one or two minor points which call for notice. P. 98: it is customary to use the spelling Catharine for the Cambridge college of that name. Similarly, Queens' College is sometimes given here as Queen's. On p. 249, the great F. W. Maitland appears as S. R. Maitland, quite another person. And on p. 78 the celebrated Herbert de Lozinga is described simply as "one Herbert, Bishop of Norwich".

Jesus College,
Cambridge.

F. J. E. Raby.

Covenant and Sacrifice. By Basil Minchin. Longmans. 10s. 6d.

A Theology of the Laity. By Hendrik Kraemer. Lutterworth Press. 15s.

Under the general title "Worship in the Body of Christ", a busy parish priest sets out with the intention of making the liturgical movement better understood. This, the first of a series, is concerned, as its title suggests, with the biblical foundations, the development of liturgical rites and other matters connected with the Eucharist. To this is added a chapter on Christian initiation and, in an appendix, a suggested form of rite based upon the discussions contained in the book itself. All of this, to say the least, is disappointing. Many laymen would find themselves in unknown waters; those with some theological background will find little that is really new, and scholars will find many small, and even not so small, points of irritation. Making the principal act of Christian worship better understood is one thing. Making it popular and "acceptable" (always a dubious word to use in such a context) at the expense of sound learning and careful writing is a different thing. Mr Minchin does not seem to like long works of scholarship. Though *The Shape of the Liturgy* is on the long side,

works of scholarship have generally a tightness, a care of writing, which is lacking in this book. Why, one cannot help asking, does the author fancy that this kind of book is more easily assimilable than works of scholarship?

Even if it is granted that by the fourth century the Church had arrived at a too narrow view of sacrifice rather than a "balanced sacrificial doctrine of the Bible" (I presume he means a biblical doctrine of sacrifice) one has to ask if in fact it is as neatly balanced as Mr Minchin likes to think it is? Furthermore, in such a balanced doctrine does thanksgiving appear to predominate over propitiation to the extent the book suggests? What this book suggests by "making Eucharist" seems itself to be unbalanced and to lack (though indeed we must await the future volumes to make sure) the fulness of Christ which his service should reflect. There is only one, and that an indirect, reference to the great discourse of St John 6; this is odd in a book that purports to be biblical.

Turning to Kraemer's Hulsean Lectures, we are invited to face with a self-confessed one-sided monotony and a Protestant outlook the place of the laity in the whole membership of the Church. On the assumption that some kind of ordained (or appointed—the difference in most cases is important but not here) ministry is necessary to the Church, how is the proper relationship between this and the larger number of called, but unspecified, members to be conceived and expressed? All, by baptism, are full members of the *koinonia*; nevertheless, the clerical-lay relationship is for some reason a prickly problem. Exactly why this is so is difficult, sometimes, to understand. Too often in the past both Catholic and Protestant churches have implied (rather than expressed) a negative attitude towards the laity. To a greater extent than Kraemer appears to realize, however, the theology—I should prefer the word "doctrine"—is bound up with the doctrine of the Church and of a ministerial priesthood within the Church. That the laity should play a more active part in the Church than their passive history has shown I would not doubt. I do, however, question what Kraemer has to say about the clerical-lay antithesis, or rather the lack of it, in the Bible. What of the exclusively elected levitical priesthood? What of the chosen twelve? Of the latter the author puts forward the suggestion that they were common and uncultured, who with others in the New Testament formed a "non-technical" ministry. What this means or why culture has anything to do with the issue, he does not tell us. What the author persists in calling the "lay issue" is not as biblical as he would like to think it is.

As a layman I do not want a doctrine, or a theology, of the laity. I want a sound doctrine of the Church which, for practical reasons, recognizes the need of a clerical-lay distinction here and now, *but not on the day of judgment.* I acknowledge we laity have much to learn if this is to come about. With all its shortcomings, this book may help us.

W. S. Boycott.

Ewen Farm House,
Near Cirencester.

BOOK NOTES

In *Renaissance and Modern Studies*, edited by V. de S. Pinto (Sisson and Parker for the University of Nottingham, 12s. 6d.), there is a useful essay by Robert Leaney on "Modern Research and the Jesus of History", which can be commended as an introduction for students; he leans rather heavily in the end on Riesenfeld's *The Gospel Tradition and its Beginnings*, which was criticized by Prof. Evans in THEOLOGY, September 1958, pp 355–62. *The Jesus of St John* by J. Ernest Davey (Lutterworth Press, 25s.) contains studies in the Fourth Gospel by a scholar who has been working on the subject for forty years; it is much concerned with the question of historicity. In *The Church Quarterly Review*, January to March 1959, we particularly liked "A Tractarian Clergyman and his friends" by Gordon Huelin: this is about William Scott, sometime Vicar of Christ Church, Hoxton, and editor of *The Christian Remembrancer*, whose correspondence has lately come to light. Note also a review article on D. M. Mackinnon's *A Study in Ethical Theory* by V. A. Demant which concludes thus: "For those who can stand listening to a prophet talking philosophy in his own very personal way, this magnificent book will be maddeningly profitable"!

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

ALLEN AND UNWIN: Errol E. Harris, *Revelation through Reason* (15s.); T. R. Miles, *Religion and the Scientific Outlook* (21s.).

BURNS OATES: Régis Jolivet, *The God of Reason* (7s. 6d.).

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS: Owen Chadwick, *Creighton on Luther* (3s. 6d.); Henry Chadwick (Ed.), *The Sentences of Sextus* (30s.); R. W. Muncey, *The New Testament Text of St Ambrose* (32s. 6d.).

GEOFFREY CHAPMAN: William Grossouw, *In Christ* (10s. 6d.); Dorothy Dohen, *Journey to Bethlehem* (8s. 6d.).

CHRISTIAN LITERATURE SOCIETY: William Stewart, *The Nature and Calling of the Church* (Rs. 3.45).

T. AND T. CLARK: Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics:* Vol. III, The Doctrine of Creation, Part 1 (45s.).

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS (O.U.P.): Joachim Wach, *The Comparative Study of Religions* (36s.).

EPWORTH PRESS: Bryan Green, *Saints Alive!* (7s. 6d. and 5s.).

FAITH PRESS: A Religious of C.S.M.V., *These Last Days* (9s. 6d.).

HIGHWAY PRESS: Cyril Bowles and Douglas Webster, *Prayers and Forms of Service for Various Missionary Occasions* (2s.); Douglas Webster, *What is Evangelism?* (5s.).

INDEPENDENT PRESS: John Huxtable, *The Promise of the Father* (6s.).

INTER-VARSITY FELLOWSHIP: D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones, *Conversions: Psychological and Spiritual* [a critique of William Sargent's *Battle for the Mind*] (2s.).

LONGMANS: Eric W. Heaton, *Commentary on the Sunday Lessons* (25s.).

PHOENIX HOUSE: Nils M. Apeland, *World Youth and the Communists* [an account of the communist penetration of the World Federation of Christian Youth and the International Union of Students] (2s. 6d.).

S.C.M. PRESS: Brian Rice, *What is Christian Giving?* (7s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K.: J. Bromley, *The Man of Ten Talents* (25s.); John Burnaby, *The Belief of Christendom* (17s. 6d.); Alan Paton, *Meditation for a Young Boy Confirmed* [reprinted from THEOLOGY, August 1958] (2s. 6d.); Martin Thornton, *Christian Proficiency* (17s. 6d.).

VALENTINE, MITCHELL: Ignaz Maybaum, *The Sacrifice of Isaac* [a Jewish theological interpretation of Gen. 22. 1–19] (3s. 6d.).

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LIMITED, GUILDFORD AND LONDON

THEOLOGY IN CONFLICT

Gustaf Wingren

An invaluable aid in the understanding of the far-reaching implications of the ideas of Barth, Bultmann and Nygren, this book concentrates on the important relationship between the law and the gospel. Gustaf Wingren reveals what he believes to be the basic flaws in the assumptions of these great theologians.

16s. net

THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF HISTORY

John McIntyre

Professor McIntyre demonstrates that as there is a Christian doctrine of Society and a Christian doctrine of Man, so there is a Christian doctrine of History.

12s. 6d. net

DOGMATICS

Hermann Diem

A major work surveying the extremely complex field of contemporary theological discussion and aiming to give a common basis upon which the divergent views of leading theologians may be discussed. His special object is to bridge the gulf which has opened up between exegesis and dogmatics and which imperils modern theological debate.

30s. net

OLIVER AND BOYD

Tweeddale Court · Edinburgh 1

The Call of God

W. Fenton Morley — *5s*

Forward by the Bishop of Peterborough

Canon Fenton Morley is concerned with the section of the Lambeth Report dealing with "Ministries and Manpower". His book is a study of Christian vocation, both "special vocations" and the general call to serve God in the "secular" field. Questions for group discussion are set out in an appendix.

Towards the Centre

Charles Jeffries — *4s 6d*

"A splendid statement of that minimum knowledge and understanding of the movement towards Christian unity lacking which no one can contribute responsibly to the debate."—*Glasgow Herald.*

God and the Human Family

John G. Williams — *5s*

"Its title makes the subject matter clear, while the name of John Williams is guarantee of its quality."—*Living Church.*

The Development of the Ministry

3s 6d

A report before the sub-committee of Committee Three of the Lambeth Conference which was responsible for considering and reporting on "Ministries and Manpower."

Meditation for a Young Man Confirmed

Alan Paton — *2s 6d*

Reprinted from *Theology*, Alan Paton's beautiful prayer has much to teach parents and all others responsible for the newly confirmed.

S·P·C·K